4.7.2.7 Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site

4.7.2.7.1 *Land Resources*

Since no new construction would be needed for any of the storage alternatives, there would be no cumulative impacts to land resources. In the case of phaseout, future use of the facility would be consistent with the land use plans outlined in site development plans.

4.7.2.7.2 *Site Infrastructure*

Since no storage alternatives would be implemented at RFETS, no major site infrastructure enhancements are anticipated, and there would not be any obvious cumulative impacts. Table 4.2.7.2–1 shows that all site infrastructure categories reported still have sufficient reserve capacity to support ongoing missions.

4.7.2.7.3 *Air Quality and Noise*

Operations at the RFETS are currently in compliance with the NAAQS as well as State regulations and guidelines. Air emissions attributable to the interim storage and phaseout of Pu would not increase concentrations of criteria pollutants. The cumulative impacts are the same as No Action concentrations except for increases in SO_2 concentrations resulting from waste management activities and are in compliance with Federal and State regulations (DOE 1995dd:14-9,14-24,14-38).

Cumulative noise impacts include contributions from existing and planned facilities including the storage facilities at the site. Noise impacts may result both from onsite noise sources and from offsite sources such as traffic. Noise impacts on individuals from the storage facilities are expected to be small, resulting in little or no increase in noise levels at offsite areas. No increase in cumulative noise impacts to offsite individuals is expected to occur.

4.7.2.7.4 *Water Resources*

Since no additional water would be needed for any of the storage alternatives, the storage program would not contribute to cumulative impacts for water resources at RFETS. There may be a decrease in water usage and wastewater generation as a result of the phaseout alternative. The benefits as a result of the phaseout alternative are expected to be negligible.

[Text deleted.]

4.7.2.7.5 *Geology and Soils*

Since no ground disturbing activities would be needed for any of the storage alternatives, there would not be cumulative impacts to geology and soils.

4.7.2.7.6 *Biological Resources*

Since no facility construction would be needed to accommodate any of the storage options, there would be no cumulative impacts to biological resources at the site.

4.7.2.7.7 *Cultural and Paleontological Resources*

Some cumulative impacts are possible at RFETS as a result of alternatives in the Waste Management PEIS. In the case of the phaseout alternative for the storage program, additional impacts could result if potentially NRHP-eligible structures were modified for other uses.

4.7.2.7.8 *Socioeconomics*

The cumulative impacts resulting from the Storage Alternatives at RFETS on the regional economy, population, housing, community services, and local transportation would be minor. In addition to the proposed phaseout of the storage mission, the only other DOE action being considered for RFETS is the Waste Management program. As shown in Table 4.7.2.7.8–1, employment generated by the Waste Management program would offset some of the job losses resulting from phaseout of the storage mission. However, the combined impact of these two actions would be to reduce the workforce from the No Action level. The cumulative impact on the regional economy and ROI housing market and community services would be minor. Any transportation congestion that may exist on roads leading to the site would be reduced slightly due to fewer site workers.

Table 4.7.2.7.8–1. Socioeconomic Cumulative Impacts at Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site

Program	Direct Employment[a]
Storage and Disposition[b]	-2,129
Waste Management	1,344
Total	-785

[a] Operations.
[b] Phaseout Alternative.
Source: DOE 1995cc; Section 4.2.7.8.

4.7.2.7.9 *Public and Occupational Health and Safety*

No additional radiological or chemical impacts are expected as a result of the storage alternatives at RFETS. Therefore, the contribution to cumulative impacts from the storage alternatives are the same as the No Action impacts shown in Section 4.2.7.9.

4.7.2.7.10 *Waste Management*

No additional waste would be generated as a result of the No Action or phaseout alternatives at RFETS. Therefore, the storage alternatives would not contribute to cumulative impacts.

4.7.2.8 Los Alamos National Laboratory

4.7.2.8.1 *Land Resources*

Since none of the alternatives would require additional ground disturbance, the storage alternatives would not contribute to cumulative impacts that may result from the two other DOE programs identified in Table 4.7.1–1. In the case of phaseout, any future use of the facility would be consistent with the land uses outlined in site development plans.

4.7.2.8.2 *Site Infrastructure*

Some cumulative impacts are possible at LANL from the implementation of the two other DOE programs identified in Table 4.7.1–1. However, since none of the storage alternatives would require facility construction or modification, the cumulative impacts would not be affected by this program.

4.7.2.8.3 *Air Quality and Noise*

Operations at LANL are currently in compliance with NAAQS and State regulations and guidelines. Air emissions attributable to the No Action and phaseout alternatives would not increase concentrations of criteria pollutants. The contribution to cumulative impacts from the storage alternatives are the same as the No Action concentrations shown in Section 4.2.8.3.

Cumulative noise impacts include contributions from existing and planned facilities including the storage facilities at the site. Noise impacts may result both from onsite noise sources and offsite sources such as traffic. Noise impacts on individuals from the storage alternatives are expected to be small, resulting in little or no increase in noise levels at offsite areas. No increase in cumulative noise impacts is expected to occur as a result of the storage alternatives.

4.7.2.8.4 *Water Resources*

Since no additional water would be needed for any of the storage alternatives, the storage program would not contribute to cumulative impacts for water resources at LANL. There may be a decrease in water usage and wastewater generation as a result of the phaseout alternative. The benefits to water resources as a result of the phaseout alternative are expected to be negligible.

4.7.2.8.5 *Geology and Soils*

Since no ground disturbing activities would be needed for any of the storage alternatives, there would be no contribution to cumulative impacts for geology and soils at LANL.

4.7.2.8.6 *Biological Resources*

Since no ground disturbing activities would be needed for any of the storage alternatives, there would be no contribution to cumulative impacts for biological resources at LANL.

4.7.2.8.7 *Cultural and Paleontological Resources*

Some cumulative impacts are possible at LANL as a result of the two DOE programs identified in Table 4.7.1–1. In the case of the phaseout alternative for the storage program, additional impacts could result if potentially NRHP-eligible structures were modified for other uses.

4.7.2.8.8 *Socioeconomics*

The storage alternatives would result in no loss of jobs at LANL. In the case of phaseout, workers currently employed in the P-storage area would be relocated to other areas. Therefore, the storage alternatives would not contribute to cumulative impacts that may result from other DOE programs.

4.7.2.8.9 *Public and Occupational Health and Safety*

No additional radiological or chemical impacts are expected as a result of the storage alternatives at LANL. Therefore, the contribution to cumulative impacts from the storage alternatives are the same as the No Action impacts shown in Section 4.2.8.9.

4.7.2.8.10 *Waste Management*

No additional waste would be generated as a result of the No Action or phaseout alternatives at LANL. Therefore, the storage alternatives would not contribute to cumulative impacts that may result from the two other DOE programs identified in Table 4.7.1–1.